DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 383 UD 013 472

AUTHOR	Fortune, Jim C.; Hutchinson, Thomas E.
TITLE	The Contrast Between Title I and Non-Title I Schools.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (Honolulu, Hawaii, December 1972)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Classroom Environment; Comparative Analysis; Compensatory Education Programs; Instructional Materials; Library Facilities; Lunch Programs; *National Surveys; *School Conditions; Socioeconomic Status; *Student Characteristics; Student Enrollment; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

The problem addressed in this paper is to compare the schools identified as participating in Title I, 1965 Elementary Secondary Education Act programs, with those identified as not participating in Title I, with regard to percentage of pupils on welfare, number of target group pupils, percentage of pupils reading below grade level, percentage of pupils receiving free lunches, type and quality of a library and special classroom facilities, conditions of physical plant, and ratings of instructional materials. Since degrees of urbanism had previously been shown to be related to some of the variables in question, the schools were grouped across the urban location variable for each comparison. Data was derived from the 1970 Survey of Compensatory Education, which included over 58,000 schools from 800 districts chosen at random from the states participating in the Belmont system. Of those schools over 33,000 have been identified as having Title I programs and nearly 25,000 have been identified as non-Title I schools. The survey had been so administrated that these schools were weighted to project the national population of elementary schools in districts having enrollments greater than 300 pupils. The comparisons between the Title I schools and the non-Title I schools utilized crosstabulations built on each of the subgroups. (Author/JM)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

Jim C. Fortune, Educational Testing Service
Thomas E. Hutchinson, University of Massachusetts

ED 097383

Problem

The equalization of educational opportunity was an underlying purpose for which Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) into law in April, 1965. ESEA Title I provided funds to public school districts to enable them to mount special programs in schools having high concentrations of pupils from low income families in order to meet the needs of academically disadvantaged pupils. The amount of funding for each state is dependent upon a formula, and the schools eligible for funding have been identified by their large percentage of economically disadvantaged children.

The 1970 Survey of Compensatory Education included over 58,000 schools from 800 districts chosen at random from the states participating in the Belmont system. Of those schools over 33,000 have been identified as having Title I programs and nearly 25,000 have been identified as non-Title I schools. The survey has been so administrated that these schools are weighted to project the national population of elementary schools in districts having enrollments greater than 300 pupils.

The problem addressed in this paper is to compare the schools identified as participating in Title I with those identified as not participating in Title I, with regard to percentage of pupils on welfare, number of target group pupils, percentage of pupils reading below grade level, percentage of pupils receiving free lunches, type and quality of a library and special classroom facilities, conditions of physical plant, and ratings of instructional materials. Since degree of urbanism has previously been shown

UD 013472

to be related to some of the variables in question, the schools will be grouped across the urban location variable for each comparison.

Procedures

The comparison between the Title I schools and the non-Title I schools across the variables in question will be made using national estimates. These comparisons will utilize crosstabulations built upon each of the subgroups, using the urban location variable as a horizontal variable and each of the variables of interest as a vertical variable. The crosstabulations will provide frequencies, row percentages, column percentages, and cell percentages. Missing data caused by incomplete item responses will be reflected in the percentage figures. Thus when non-response categories are omitted, the percentages will fail to total 100.

In all, twelve tables will be discussed. The variables to be compared in these tables include: (1) percentage of families on welfare, (2) number of socioeconomically and academically disadvantaged pupils, (3) percentage of pupils reading below grade level, (4) percentage of pupils receiving free lunches, (5) number of schools with library facilities, (6) number of schools with learning laboratories, (7) number of schools with teacher reference centers, (8) ratings of physical plant conditions, (9) ratings of suitability of physical plant, (10) ratings of quality of printed materials, (11) ratings of adequacy of audio-visual materials, and (12) ratings of the adequacy of the instructional equipment.

Results

Table 1-a shows the crosstabulations of the Title I schools across the urbanism variable and across percentages of families on welfare. Of the

58,685 projected schools, 177 were not classifiable as either Title I or non-Title I schools. The number of Title I participating schools was estimated at 33,848 and nonparticipating schools at 24,837. A nonresponse projection of 964 schools was calculated for the urbanism item.

Table I-b shows a crosstabulation of the same variables for the non-participating schools. The urbanism variable has nine categories based on schools' location--very large cities (over 500,000 population), large cities (200,000 to 500,000 population), suburbs of large cities, rural areas near large cities, middle-sized cities (50,000 to 200,000 population), suburbs of middle-sized cities, rural areas near middle-sized cities, small cities (less than 50,000 population), or isolated rural areas. Of the 3240 schools projected to be in very large cities, 949 or 29% participate in Title I; of the 3252 schools in large cities, 1411 or -% participate in Title I; 2886 or -% of the 6450 schools located in the suburbs of large cities participate in Title I 1287 or -% of the 2137 schools projected to be in rural areas near large cities participate in Title I; and 2535 or -% of the 5157 schools estimated to be in middle-sized cities participate in Title I. Also, 1408 or -% of 3446 schools in suburbs of middle-sized cities, 3445 or -% of the 4674 schools projected to be in rural areas near middle-sized cities, 9554 or -% of 15,933 schools in small cities, and 9579 or -% of 13,255 rural schools participate in Title I, indicating a bias toward rural Title I participation. This bias is due to the small number of schools in rural districts. Sometimes single schools or two schools out of three are made eligible in small districts.

The variable based on percentage of families receiving welfare has seven categories: none, 1-10%, 11-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76-90% and 91-100%. It seems worth noting that in general the percentage of schools participating

in Title I programs increases as the percentage of welfare families increases. Only 949 of the 6045 schools reporting no families on welfare participate in Title I (16%), white 54% of the schools having between 1-10% families on welfare participate in Title I activities. Title I participation is even greater for schools having higher proportions of families on welfare. Seventy eight per cent of the 10,629 schools in the 11-25% category, 84% of the 4149 in the 26-50% category, 81% of the 1488 in the 51-75% category, 78% of the 400 in the 76-90% category, and 90% of the 112 in the 91-100% category participate in Title I. In looking at the crosstabulations, those schools participating in Title I but not reporting any families on welfare are mostly rural or small city schools, where welfare may not be available. Schools having high percentages of families on welfare but not participating in Title I also appear more frequently in small city and rural schools. The middle-sized cities also have a disproportionate number of schools with high percentages of welfare families who do not participate in Title I.

Table 2 shows the crosstabulation between the school participation-urbanism variable and the pupil classification variable. This table presents frequency of pupil target group membership in each category of schools. The pupil classification variable breaks pupils into four categories: not disadvantaged, economically disadvantaged only, academically disadvantaged only, and both economically and academically disadvantaged. The 10,512,949 pupils estimated from the multi-staged weighted sample are divided into the four groups so that 78.68% fall in the not-disadvantaged category, 8.20% in the socioeconomically disadvantaged only category, 7.68% in the academically only category, and 5.44% in the category of both economically and academically disadvantaged.

Differences between schools participating in Title I and schools not participating in Title I become very evident when composition of disadvantaged categories is considered. Of the 5,495,959 pupils identified as attending schools participating in Title I, 4,004,910 (75%) pupils have been identified as not being disadvantaged. Of the 4,559,160 pupils identified as attending schools which do not participate in Title I, 3,919,389 or 86% of the pupils have been classified as not being disadvantaged. The greatest concentration of non-disadvantaged children is in non-participating schools located in suburbs. Perhaps the most apparent difference between the two groups of schools can be seen in the concentrations of socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils. This would be expected considering the identification criterion, which is based upon percentages of low income families. In Title I schools 1,037,303 or a little over two thirds of those pupils labled disadvantaged, were identified as socioeconomically disadvantaged. In non-Title I schools 326,769 pupils, or approximately half of the pupils labeled as disadvantaged, were socioeconomically disadvantaged.

In Title I schools 872,748 pupils were labeled academically disadvantaged, while in non-Title I schools 439,619 pupils were so labeled. In the area of academic disadvantagement the groups schools are less different than they are for socioeconomic disadvantagement. The Title I schools show 16% of their pupils as academically disadvantaged while non-Title I schools have less than 10% of their pupils so classified. The category of pupils labeled as both academically and socioeconomically disadvantaged shows a wide difference between the two groups of schools, the Title I participating schools showing the most--419,002 to 126,617. The cities show the largest

concentrations of economically disadvantaged pupils with the Title I schools having more than the non-Title I schools. There are unexpected numbers of academically disadvantaged pupils in non-Title I schools located in rural areas.

Low reading level is perhaps the best indicator of academic disadvantagement and is certainly a persisting problem for all schools. Table 3 shows the crosstabulation between percentage of pupils reading below grade level and the school classification variable. Non-responses included 13.43% of the schools, with 7.6% coming from the Title I participating schools and 5.51% from the non-participating schools. Differences between the two groups of schools are most apparent when one considers schools having more than 25% of their pupils reading one or more years under their grade level. Over 37% of the Title I schools meet this criterion and less than 25 % of the non-Title I schools meet the criterion. The suburbs for both Title I participating and non-participating schools tend to have the lower percentages of reading problems. Title I schools in large and middle-sized cities and rural schools not participating in Title I seem to have the largest percentages of reading problems.

Tables 4a and 4b show the crosstabulations of the urbanism variable with the percentage of pupils receiving free lunches, a variable hypothesized to be another good indicator of poverty level. On the whole, over 69% of the schools have free lunch programs. Differences between Title I and non-Title I schools can be seen both in terms of non-responses, which probably indicate no program, and in the percentage categories greater than 10%. Of the schools not participating in Title I, 42% did not respond

to the free lunch item. This nonresponse rate represents 18.09% of the total population. Of the Title I schools, 22% did not respond, constituting 12.70% of the total population. Of the schools reporting that over 10% of students receive free lunch, the Title I schools outnumber the non-Title I schools over three to one. Over 38% of the Title I schools and better than 22% of the total population are Title I participating schools providing more than 10% of their pupils with free lunches. Almost 14% of the schools not participating in Title I and only 6% of the total population are schools which provide free lunches to over 10% of their pupils and which do not participate in Title I. The same urban-rural bias as observed in percentages on welfare exists for percentages receiving free lunches.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 deal with special educational facilities in the schools. Tables 5a and 5b deal with central libraries for the two groups of schools; Tables 6a and 6b deal with learning laboratories; and Tables 7a and 7b deal with the existence of teacher reference centers in the schools. There appears to be very little difference between the two groups of schools in terms of availability of central libraries, with 79% of the Title I schools and 78% of the non-participating schools having central libraries. On the other hand, almost 92% of the schools do not have learning laboratories. Of the 8% having such laboratories, over 60% are participating Title I schools. Nearly 45% of the projected population of schools reported having teacher reference centers. Similar percentages of participating Title I schools and of non-participating schools were found. Hence, in terms of special educational facilities there appears to be little difference between the two groups of schools.

Tables 8 and 9 show crosstabulations of the urbanism variable and the principal's ratings of his physical plant for the groups in question. Tables 8a and 8b include the principal's ratings of the condition of the physical plant. Tables 9a and 9b include the principal's ratings of the suitability of the physical plant. In terms of physical plant condition, the Title I participating schools are rated a little more negatively than the group of non-participating schools; however, the difference between the two groups is not very large. A little over 21% of the Title I schools and slightly over 29% of the non-Title I schools had physical plants whose conditions were rated as excellent. Almost 40% of the Title I schools and over 43% of the non-Title I schools had physical plants rated by their principals as being in good condition. On the other hand, 28% of the Title I schools and 19% of the non-Title I schools had plants rated only in fair condition. Nearly 11% of the Title I schools and almost 8% of the non-Title I schools had physical plants rated in poor condition. No urbanism difference was observed.

Tables 9a and 9b show the principal's ratings of suitability of his school's physical plant. The major differences between the two groups appear in the excellent and poor ratings, as the ratings of good and fair seem equally likely in both populations. "Good" and "fair" each appear about 38% of the time in each distribution of schools. The non-Title I schools appear to be rated more favorably than the Title I schools about 5% of the time. Nine percent of the Title I schools and 12% of the non-Title I schools received "excellent" ratings from their principals. Sixteen percent of the Title I schools and 11% of the non-Title I schools

received "poor" ratings from their principals. This discrepancy between the two groups appears to be a result of the unexpectedly rural and small high number of Title I rural and Title I small city schools receiving "poor" ratings.

Tables 10, 11, and 12 deal with instructional materials and equipment. Tables 10a and 10b cross the urbanism variable with ratings by principals of printed materials. Again, the two groups of schools appear very much alike. The non-Title I group appears to differ from the Title I schools for about 4% of the population. The non-Title I schools received 4% more "excellent" ratings (23% to 19%) than did the Title I schools. This differential also appears in the "fair" category, where 4% more Title I schools (20%) received fair ratings than did the non-Title I schools (16%). Equal proportions of the groups received "good" ratings (56%) and "poor" ratings (3%). There appears to be an interaction tendency in the Title I rural "excellent" cell. In this cell Title I receives more than expected frequency accumulation. The discrepancy between Title I and non-Title I schools on the "excellent" rating seems to be explained partially by the over-accumulation in the non-Title I suburbs "excellent" cell and partially in terms of small accumulative differences over the cities (very large, large and middle-sized). The discrepancy between the two categories in terms of the "fair" rating shows more Title I schools than non-Title I schools in small cities and isolated rural areas receiving this rating.

Tables 11a and 11b show the principals' ratings for quality of audio-visual materials across the urbanism variable for Title I and non-Title I schools. Differences in the Two Groups of schools, again, occur in the

"excellent" and "fair" categories, favoring the non-Title I schools. Title I schools had fewer percentages of "excellent" ratings then were observed for non-Title I schools--12% to 15%. Over 51% of the Title I schools received "good" ratings, and 52% of the non-Title I schools received "good" ratings. The largest discrepancy between the two groups is on the number of schools receiving only "fair" ratings. Almost 30% of the Title I school group received "fair" ratings as compared to 25% of the non-Title I school group. Both groups received proportional number of "poor" ratings, approximately 5%. The largest discrepancy is between the small cities and rural Title I schools categories for the "fair" rating.

Tables 12a and 12b show the principals' ratings of quality of instructional equipment. Again the differences are very similar to those found for audio-visual equipment, but the discrepancies do not appear as large. The principals rated Title I schools on instructional equipment slightly less favorably than the principals rated the schools not participating in Title I. For the Title I schools 14% received "excellent" ratings, 54% "good," 27% "fair" and 4% "poor." For the non-Title I schools 16% received "excellent" ratings, 54% received "good," 23% "fair" and 4% "poor." The small city and rural areas again appeared to be the major sources of difference.

The ratings of instructional supplies and the existence of special facilities were not found to be as different as one might expect. However, the differences found still indicate that Title I participating schools appear to lack the quality of non-Title I schools.

TABLE I

PERCENT OF FAMILIES ON WELFARE BY TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

School Type		None	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-90%	91-100%	Totals
Title I Schools	Frequency	949	19392	8323	3471	1204	317	105	33761
	Column Percents	15.56	54.53	78.31	83.81	81.19	79.25	93.75	57.83
Non-Title I Schools	Frequency	5096	16173	2306	678	279	83	7	24622
	Column Percents	84.44	45.47	21.69	16.19	18.81	20.75	6.25	42.17
Totals	Frequency	6035	35565	10629	4149	1483	400	112	58383
	Row Percents	10.34	60.93	18.21	7.11	2.54	0.68	0.19	

TABLE II

NUMBER OF ACADEMICALLY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED PUPILS BY TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

School Type		Not Economically Or Academically Disadvantaged	Economically Disadvantaged Only	Academically Disadvantaged Only	Both Economically And Academically Disadvantaged	Totals
Title I Schools	Frequency	4004910	618301	453746	419002	5495959
	Row Percents	72.87	11.25	8.25	7.63	
	Column Percents	48.41	71.76	56.16	73.29	52.28
Non-Title I Schools	Frequency	4266978	243260	354107	152645	5016990
	Row Percents	85.05	4.85	7.06	3.04	
	Column Percents	51.59	28.24	43.84	26.71	47.72
Totals	Frequency	8271888	861561	807853	571647	10512949
	Row Percents	78.69	8.19	7.69	5.43	

TABLE III

PERCENT OF PUPILS READING BELOW GRADE LEVEL BY TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

School Type		None	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-90%	91-100%	Totals
Title I Schools	Frequency	797	5863	9951	8215	3174	1213	159	29372
	Colum. Percents	36.57	48.31	56.06	64.73	75.42	78.97	56.38	57.82
Non-Title I Schools	Frequency	1382	6274	7799	4476	1034	323	133	21421
	Column Percents	63.43	51.69	43.94	35.27	24.58	21.03	43.62	42.18
Totals	Frequency	2179	12137	17750	12691	4208	1536	282	50793
	Row Percents	4.29	23.89	34.94	24.98	8.28	3.02	0.60	

TABLE IV

RATINGS OF PHYSICAL PLANT CONDITIONS BY TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

School Type		Number Rated Excellent	Number Rated Good	Number Rated Fair	Number Rated Poor	Totals
Title I Schools	Frequency	7181	13525	9342	3592	33640
	Column Percents	49.38	55.53	67.01	66.69	57.75
Non-Title I Schools	Frequency	7383	10830	4599	1794	24606
	Column Percents	50.62	44.47	32.99	33.31	42.25
Totals	Frequency	14564	24355	13941	5386	58246
	Row Percents	25.00	41.81	23.93	9.26	

TABLE V

RATINGS OF PHYSICAL PLANT SUITABILITY BY TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

School Type		Number Rated Excellent	Number Rated Good	Number Rated Fair	Number Rated Poor	Totals
Title I Schools	Frequency	3127	12513	12679	5228	33547
	Column Percents	49.91	56.70	57.94	66.59	57.77
Non-Title I Schools	Frequency	3138	9555	9205	2623	24521
	Column Percents	50.09	43.30	42.06	33.41	42.23
Totals	Frequency	6265	22068	21884	7851	58068
	Row Percents	10.79	38.00	37.68	13.53	

TABLE VI

RATINGS OF QUALITY OF PRINTED MATERIALS BY TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

School Type		Number Rated Excellent	Number Rated Good	Number Rated Fair	Number Rated Poor	Totals
Title I Schools	Frequency	6470	19253	6902	1009	33634
	Column Percents	52.52	57.89	63.89	54.89	57.77
Non-Title I Schools	Frequency	5849	13999	3901	829	24578
	Column Percents	47.48	42.11	36.11	45.11	42.23
Totals	Frequency	12319	33252	10803	1838	58212
	Row Percents	21.16	57.12	18.55	3.17	

TABLE VII

RATINGS OF QUALITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT BY TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

School Type		Number Rated Excellent	Number Rated Good	Number Rated Fair	Number Rated Poor	Totals
Title I Schools	Frequency	4867	18199	9088	1427	33581
	Column Percents	54.49	57.24	61.33	57.44	57.87
Non-Title I Schools	Frequency	4065	13594	5730	1057	24446
	Column Percents	45.51	42.76	38.67	42.56	42.13
Totals	Frequency	8932	31793	14818	2484	58027
	Row Percents	15.39	54.79	25.53	4.29	

TABLE 8a

URBANISM BY CONDITION OF PHYSICAL PLANT
(TITLE I SCHOOLS)

	T1 LC1	T1 LC2	T1 SUB/L	T1 RUR/L	T1 MC	T1 SUB/M	T1 RUR/M	T1 SC	T1 RURAL	ROW TOTAL
T1/EXCL	133	303	897	327	382	297	758	2135	1860	7181
	1.85	4.22	12.49	4.55	5.32	4.14	10.56	29.73	25.90	12.23
	13.99	21.46	31.06	25.39	14.57	21.11	21.99	22.34	19.42	
	0.23	0.52	1.53	0.59	0.65	0.51	1.29	3.64	3.17	
T1/GOOD	403	544	1146	374	1256	819	1610	3732	3226	13525
	2.98	4.02	8.47	2.77	9.29	6.06	11.90	27.59	23.85	23.04
	42.38	38.53	39.68	29.04	47.92	58.21	46.71	39.05	33.67	
	0.69	0.93	1.95	0.64	2.14	1.40	2.74	6.36	5.50	
T1/FAIR	252	435	681	343	748	173	871	2455	3204	9342
	2.70	4.66	7.29	3.67	8.01	1.85	9.32	26.28	34.30	15.92
	26.50	30.81	23.58	26.63	28.54	12.30	25.27	25.69	33.44	
	0.43	0.74	1.16	0.58	1.27	0.29	1.48	4.18	5.46	
T1/POOR	148	106	164	244	217	118	182	1180	1207	3592
	4.12	2.95	4.57	6.79	6.04	3.29	5.07	32.85	33.60	6.12
	15.56	7.51	5.68	18.94	8.28	8.39	5.28	12.35	12.60	
	0.25	0.18	0.28	0.42	0.37	0.20	0.31	2.01	2.06	

TABLE 8b

URBANISM BY CONDITION OF PHYSICAL PLANT
(NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS)

	T2 LC1	T2 LC2	T2 SUB/L	T2 RUR/L	T2 MC	T2 SUB/M	T2 RUR/M	T2 SC	T2 RURAL	ROW TOTAL
T2/EXCL	521	574	1177	130	774	692	452	2068	792	7383
	7.06	7.77	15.94	1.76	10.48	9.37	6.12	28.01	10.73	12.58
	22.74	31.16	33.03	15.26	30.53	33.97	36.78	32.42	21.54	
	0.89	0.98	2.01	0.22	1.32	1.18	0.77	3.52	1.35	
T2/GOOD	790	821	1637	451	1245	821	419	2847	1465	10830
	7.29	7.58	15.12	4.16	11.50	7.58	3.87	26.29	13.53	18.45
	34.48	44.57	45.94	52.93	48.11	40.30	34.09	44.63	39.84	
	1.35	1.40	2.79	0.77	2.12	1.40	0.71	4.85	2.50	
T2/FAIR	428	278	474	122	424	509	195	1165	849	4599
	9.31	6.04	10.31	2.65	9.22	11.07	4.24	25.33	18.46	7.83
	18.68	15.09	13.30	14.32	16.73	24.99	15.87	18.26	23.09	
	0.73	0.47	0.81	0.21	0.72	0.87	0.35	1.98	1.45	
T2/POOR	171	145	253	149	80	15	133	280	541	1794
	9.53	8.08	14.10	8.31	4.46	0.84	7.41	15.61	30.16	3.06
	7.46	7.87	7.10	17.49	3.16	0.74	10.82	4.39	14.71	
	0.29	0.25	0.43	0.25	0.14	0.03	0.23	0.48	0.92	

TABLE 9a

URBANISM BY SUITABILITY OF PHYSICAL PLANT
(TITLE I SCHOOLS)

	T1 LC1	T1 LC2	T1 SUB/L	T1 RUR/L	T1 MC	T1 SUB/M	T1 RUR/M	T1 SC	T1 RURAL	ROW TOTAL
T1/EXCL	75	87	306	121	200	115	428	961	779	3127
	2.40	2.78	9.79	3.87	6.40	3.66	13.69	30.73	24.91	5.33
	7.89	6.16	10.90	9.39	7.63	8.17	12.42	10.06	8.13	
	0.13	0.15	0.52	0.21	0.34	0.20	0.73	1.64	1.33	
T1/GOOD	317	438	953	295	878	598	1536	3589	3575	12513
	2.53	3.50	7.62	2.36	7.02	4.78	12.28	28.68	28.57	21.31
	33.33	31.00	33.00	22.89	33.49	42.47	44.57	37.56	37.31	
	0.54	0.75	1.62	0.50	1.50	1.02	2.62	6.11	6.09	
T1/FAIR	284	567	1157	593	947	470	1253	3611	3624	12679
	2.24	4.47	9.13	4.68	7.47	3.71	9.88	28.48	28.58	21.60
	29.86	40.13	40.06	46.00	36.12	33.38	36.36	37.79	37.82	
	0.48	0.97	1.97	1.01	1.61	0.80	2.13	6.15	6.17	
T1/POOR	252	290	472	280	589	225	229	1222	1520	5228
	4.82	5.55	9.03	5.36	11.27	4.30	4.38	23.37	29.07	8.91
	26.50	20.52	16.34	21.72	22.46	15.98	6.65	12.79	15.36	
	0.43	0.49	0.80	0.48	1.00	0.38	0.39	2.08	2.59	

TABLE 9b

URBANISM BY SUITABILITY OF PHYSICAL PLANT
(NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS)

	T2 LC1	T2 LC2	T2 SUB/L	T2 RUR/L	T2 MC	T2 SUB/M	T2 RUR/M	T2 SC	T2 RURAL	ROW TOTAL
T2/EXCL	202	129	642	130	383	270	133	869	328	3138
	6.44	4.11	20.46	4.14	12.21	8.60	4.24	27.69	10.45	5.35
	8.81	7.01	18.01	15.26	15.10	13.25	10.81	13.62	8.92	
	0.34	0.22	1.09	0.22	0.65	0.46	0.23	1.48	0.56	
T2/GOOD	646	711	1297	295	1053	677	555	2614	1432	9555
	6.76	7.44	13.57	3.09	11.02	7.09	5.81	27.36	14.99	16.28
	28.16	38.62	36.39	34.62	41.52	33.22	45.12	40.97	38.94	
	1.10	1.21	2.21	0.50	1.79	1.15	0.95	4.45	2.44	
T2/FAIR	802	718	1166	306	927	1036	377	2289	1396	9205
	8.71	7.80	12.67	3.32	10.07	11.25	4.10	24.87	15.17	15.68
	34.96	39.00	32.72	35.92	36.55	50.83	30.65	35.88	37.97	
	1.37	1.22	1.99	0.52	1.58	1.76	0.64	3.90	2.38	
T2/POOR	261	250	425	105	170	55	135	608	411	2623
	9.95	9.53	16.20	4.00	6.48	2.10	5.15	23.18	15.67	4.47
	11.38	13.58	11.92	12.32	6.70	2.70	10.98	9.53	11.18	
	0.44	0.43	0.72	0.18	0.29	0.09	0.23	1.04	0.70	

TABLE 10a

URBANISM BY QUALITY OF PRINTED MATERIALS
(TITLE I SCHOOLS)

	T1 LC1	T1 LC2	T1 SUB/L	T1 RUR/L	T1 MC	T1 SUB/M	T1 RUR/M	T1 SC	T1 RURAL	ROW TOTAL
T1/EXCL	159	280	894	323	467	392	453	2007	1252	6470
	2.46	4.33	13.82	4.99	7.22	6.06	7.00	31.02	19.35	11.02
	16.74	19.83	30.96	25.06	17.81	27.84	13.15	21.00	13.07	
	0.27	0.48	1.52	0.55	0.80	0.67	0.77	3.42	2.13	
T1/GOOD	519	725	1507	798	1620	740	1878	5506	5653	19253
	2.70	3.77	7.83	4.14	8.41	3.84	9.75	28.60	29.36	32.80
	54.63	51.35	52.18	61.91	61.78	52.56	54.50	57.62	59.01	
	0.88	1.24	2.57	1.36	2.76	1.26	3.20	9.38	9.63	
T1/FAIR	248	341	447	129	444	262	934	1717	2237	6902
	3.59	4.94	6.48	1.87	6.43	3.80	13.53	24.88	32.41	11.76
	26.11	24.15	15.48	10.01	16.93	18.61	27.10	17.97	23.35	
	0.42	0.58	0.76	0.22	0.76	0.45	1.59	2.92	3.81	
T1/POOR	9	39	40	39	83	14	181	233	354	1009
	0.89	3.87	3.96	3.87	8.23	1.39	17.94	23.09	35.08	1.72
	0.95	2.76	1.39	3.03	3.17	0.99	5.25	2.44	3.70	
	0.02	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.14	0.02	0.31	0.40	0.60	

TABLE 10b

URBANISM BY QUALITY OF PRINTED MATERIALS
(NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS)

	T2 LC1	T2 LC2	T2 SUB/L	T2 RUR/L	T2 MC	T2 SUB/M	T2 RUR/M	T2 SC	T2 RURAL	ROW TOTAL
T2/EXCL	464	431	1199	269	628	504	274	1617	307	5849
	7.93	7.37	20.50	4.60	10.74	8.62	4.68	27.65	5.25	9.96
	20.24	23.42	33.65	31.57	24.75	24.73	22.29	25.34	8.35	
	0.79	0.73	2.04	0.46	1.07	0.86	0.47	2.75	0.52	
T2/GOOD	1113	1031	1970	550	1593	1109	658	3852	1657	13999
	7.95	7.36	14.07	3.93	11.38	7.92	4.70	27.52	11.84	23.85
	48.54	56.03	55.29	64.55	62.79	54.42	53.54	60.38	45.05	
	1.90	1.76	3.36	0.94	2.71	1.89	1.12	6.56	2.82	
T2/FAIR	316	328	337	33	176	425	176	714	1298	3901
	8.10	8.41	9.64	0.85	4.51	10.88	4.51	18.30	33.27	6.65
	13.78	17.83	9.46	3.87	6.94	20.85	14.32	11.19	35.29	
	0.54	0.56	0.57	0.06	0.30	0.72	0.30	1.22	2.21	
T2/POOR	18	26	18	0	114	0	91	197	365	829
	2.17	3.14	2.17	0.00	13.75	0.00	10.98	23.76	44.03	1.41
	0.78	1.41	0.51	0.00	4.49	0.00	7.40	3.09	9.92	
	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.16	0.34	0.62	

TABLE 11a

URBANISM BY QUALITY OF AUDIO-VISUAL MATERIALS
(TITLE I SCHOOLS)

	T1 LC1	T1 LC2	T1 SUB/L	T1 RUR/L	T1 MC	T1 SUB/M	T1 RUR/M	T1 SC	T1 RURAL	ROW TOTAL
T1/EXCL	145	276	565	302	305	212	276	1313	725	4312
	3.36	6.40	13.10	7.00	7.07	4.92	6.40	30.45	16.81	7.35
	15.25	18.53	19.26	23.47	11.63	15.07	8.01	13.74	7.57	
	0.25	0.47	0.96	0.51	0.52	0.36	0.47	2.24	1.24	
T1/GOOD	378	654	1504	589	1408	691	1744	4726	5311	17343
	2.18	3.77	8.67	3.40	8.12	3.98	10.06	27.25	30.62	29.55
	39.75	46.28	52.08	45.77	53.70	49.11	50.61	49.45	55.44	
	0.64	1.11	2.56	1.00	2.40	1.18	2.97	3.05	9.05	
T1/FAIR	377	384	691	379	766	491	1106	2847	2954	10103
	3.73	3.80	6.84	3.75	7.58	4.86	10.95	28.18	29.24	17.21
	39.64	27.18	23.93	29.45	29.21	34.90	32.10	29.79	30.84	
	0.64	0.65	1.18	0.65	1.30	0.84	1.88	4.85	5.03	
T1/POOR	36	68	128	13	135	13	320	552	506	1841
	1.96	3.69	6.95	0.71	7.33	0.71	17.38	29.98	27.49	3.14
	3.79	4.81	4.43	1.01	5.15	0.92	9.29	5.78	5.28	
	0.06	0.12	0.22	0.02	0.23	0.02	0.55	0.94	0.86	

TABLE 11b

URBANISM BY QUALITY OF AUDIO-VISUAL MATERIALS
(NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS)

	T2 LC1	T2 LC2	T2 SUB/L	T2 RUR/L	T2 MC	T2 SUB/M	T2 RUR/M	T2 SC	T2 RURAL	ROW TOTAL
T2/EXCL	376	387	885	235	311	464	81	846	154	3863
	9.73	10.02	22.91	6.08	8.05	12.01	2.10	21.90	3.99	6.58
	16.41	21.01	24.82	27.61	12.27	22.79	6.59	13.26	4.19	
	0.64	0.66	1.51	0.40	0.53	0.79	0.14	1.44	0.26	
T2/GOOD	837	881	2056	314	1530	1191	766	3592	1519	13031
	6.42	6.76	15.78	2.41	11.74	9.14	5.88	27.57	11.66	22.20
	36.53	47.83	57.67	36.90	60.36	58.50	62.33	56.31	41.30	
	1.43	1.50	3.50	0.53	2.61	2.03	1.30	6.12	2.59	
T2/FAIR	566	425	515	207	598	360	294	1597	1561	6331
	8.94	6.71	8.13	3.27	9.45	5.69	4.64	25.23	24.66	10.79
	24.71	23.07	14.45	24.32	23.59	17.68	23.92	25.04	42.44	
	0.96	0.72	0.88	0.35	1.02	0.61	0.50	2.72	2.66	
T2/POOR	124	99	87	95	93	9	58	310	393	1301
	9.53	7.61	6.69	7.30	7.15	0.69	4.46	23.83	30.21	2.22
	5.41	5.37	2.44	11.16	3.67	0.44	4.72	4.86	10.69	
	0.21	0.17	0.15	0.16	0.16	0.02	0.10	0.53	0.67	

TABLE 12a

URBANISM BY QUALITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT
(TITLE I SCHOOLS)

	T1 LC1	T1 LC2	T1 SUB/L	T1 RUR/L	T1 MC	T1 SUB/M	T1 RUR/M	T1 SC	T1 RURAL	ROW TOTAL
T1/EXCL	182	257	651	352	354	220	361	1380	894	4867
	3.74	5.28	13.38	7.23	7.27	4.52	7.42	28.35	18.37	8.29
	19.16	18.20	22.55	27.31	13.50	15.64	10.48	14.44	9.33	
	0.31	0.44	1.11	0.60	0.60	0.37	0.62	2.35	1.52	
T1/GOOD	362	610	1586	608	1502	735	1810	5311	5346	18199
	1.99	3.35	8.71	3.34	8.25	4.04	9.95	29.18	29.38	31.00
	38.11	43.20	54.94	47.17	57.28	52.24	52.54	55.58	55.81	
	0.62	1.04	2.70	1.04	2.56	1.25	3.08	9.05	9.11	
T1/FAIR	322	427	515	226	654	443	1125	2396	2867	9088
	3.54	4.70	5.67	2.49	7.20	4.87	12.38	26.36	31.55	15.48
	33.89	30.24	17.84	17.53	24.94	31.49	32.66	25.07	29.93	
	0.55	0.73	0.88	0.39	1.11	0.75	1.92	4.08	4.88	
T1/POOR	69	79	135	99	104	9	149	377	389	1427
	4.84	5.54	9.46	6.94	7.29	0.63	10.44	26.42	27.26	2.43
	7.26	5.59	4.68	7.68	3.97	0.64	4.33	3.95	4.06	
	0.12	0.13	0.23	0.17	0.18	0.02	0.25	0.64	0.66	

TABLE 12b

URBANISM BY QUALITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT
(NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS)

	T2 LC1	T2 LC2	T2 SUB/L	T2 RUR/L	T2 MC	T2 SUB/M	T2 RUR/M	T2 SC	T2 RURAL	ROW TOTAL
T2/EXCL	287	376	660	152	395	497	88	1143	329	4065
	7.06	9.25	15.50	3.74	9.72	12.23	2.16	28.12	8.09	6.93
	12.52	20.42	17.68	17.86	15.58	24.39	7.16	17.92	8.95	
	0.49	0.64	1.07	0.26	0.67	0.85	0.15	1.95	0.56	
T2/GOOD	994	924	2224	517	1513	1191	694	3532	1667	13594
	7.31	6.80	16.36	3.80	11.13	8.76	5.11	25.98	12.26	23.16
	43.35	50.19	52.40	60.75	59.68	58.44	56.47	55.37	45.32	
	1.69	1.57	3.79	0.88	2.58	2.03	1.18	6.02	2.84	
T2/FAIR	521	441	600	105	494	331	359	1450	1257	5730
	9.09	7.70	10.47	1.83	8.62	5.78	6.27	25.31	21.94	9.76
	22.72	23.95	16.84	12.34	18.49	16.24	29.21	22.73	34.18	
	0.89	0.75	1.02	0.18	0.84	0.56	0.61	2.47	2.14	
T2/POOR	91	76	88	77	107	7	58	175	345	1057
	8.61	7.19	3.33	7.28	10.12	0.66	5.49	16.56	32.64	1.80
	3.97	4.13	2.47	9.05	4.22	0.34	4.72	2.74	9.38	
	0.16	0.13	0.15	0.13	0.18	0.01	0.10	0.30	0.59	